

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In view of the following discussion, the Applicant submits that none of the claims now pending in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 USC § 103. Thus, the Applicant believes that the pending claim is now in allowable form.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in the claim now pending in the application, the Examiner should telephone Ms. Alberta A. Vitale, Esq. at (203) 469-8097 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Status of pending claims

Claim 2 remains as previously presented. No claims have been canceled or amended.

35 USC § 103 Rejections

Applicant notes that it appears that the Examiner made an error by referring to claim 3 in the rejection. (Office action, page 2, paragraph 3). The Listing of the Claims in the pending application includes only a single claim, claim 2. In the present response Applicant refers to the rejected (pending) claim as "claim 2".

Appl. No. 09/554,344  
Amdt. dated April 26, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of Dec. 28, 2004

The Office action, pages 2-3, paragraph 3, has rejected claim 2 under the provisions of 35 USC § 103 as being obvious over the teachings in the Conoscenti patent (United States patent 5,627,836 issued to Lisa Conoscenti et al on May 6, 1997 (hereinafter Conoscenti)) taken in view of the Doshi patent (United States patent 5,688,475 issued to Baharat T. Doshi et al on October 22, 1996 (hereinafter Doshi)). This rejection is respectfully traversed in the foregoing remarks.

The Examiner states "Conoscenti et al does not expressly disclose a group of different destinations being subdivided into various subgroups of the destination stations, each of the destination stations in each of the subgroups detect VPIs and VCIs." (Office action, page 3, first full paragraph). Applicant emphasizes that in the present application a subgroup destination stations is characterized by one subgroup VCI (page 1 of PCT/EP99/00314, lines 28-29). Thus, the VCI has the same value for each destination station within the same sub-group.

Furthermore, the Examiner refers to Doshi stating the "cell-routing concept" described in Doshi states that "[a] virtual circuit connection, VCC, is an end-to-end connection between two devices and is formed by concatenation (sub-group) of VCLs (column 1, lines 36-38)"). Applicant notes that Doshi's "concatenation" of VCLs (column 1, lines 36-38) indicates a concatenation of VCLs (VCIs), each representing a logical link between two (geographically separated) switches

(column 1, lines 32-33). The concatenation thus involves two or more different VCLs (VCIs). This could be seen as a "group of (multiple VCLs)," which together form one end-to-end VCC. In this case one VCC, and a group of (different) VCLs (VCIs) correspond with the end-to-end VCC. This means there are different values for the different VCLs (VCIs) in this group of VCLs (VCIs).

Hence, if a person of ordinary skills in the art employs Doshi in view of Conoscenti, this will lead only to a general understanding of end-to-end VCCs in ATM networks (being a concatenation of two or more different (local) VCLs between switches) and perhaps some improvements in network administration.

Applicant notes however, that there is no teaching or suggestion of subdividing destinations into various subgroups or destination stations (by means of the VCI (VCL) with the same value for each destination station within the same sub-group). This is especially relevant for receiving "messages" sent by a source station to one specific group of destination stations. For example: voice, data or video broadcasting from a Service Provider to a specific group of customers (subgroup of destination terminals). Applicant's claimed invention addresses this, stating "and a VCI equal to the VCI of the virtual connection of said each subgroup of the destination stations." (Claim 2, last lines).

Appl. No. 09/554,344  
Amdt. dated April 26, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of Dec. 28, 2004

For all of the above stated reasons, claim 2 is not obvious.


Conclusion

Thus, the Applicant submits that the claim, presently in the application, is not obvious under the provisions of 35 USC § 103.

Consequently, the Applicant believes that the claim is presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

April 26, 2005

  
Peter L. Michaelson, Attorney  
Reg. No. 30,090  
Customer No. 007265  
(732) 530-6671

MICHAELSON & ASSOCIATES  
Counselors at Law  
Parkway 109 Office Center  
328 Newman Springs Road  
P.O. Box 8489  
Red Bank, New Jersey 07701

Appl. No. 09/554,344

Amdt. dated April 26, 2005

Reply to Office Action of Dec. 28, 2004

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING under 37 C.F.R. 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited on **April 27, 2005** with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to:

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450



Signature

30,090

Reg. No.

(PTT93RCEAMEND/ca:146)